

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**NOTICE OF PENALTIES INCURRED AND DUE
FOR VIOLATIONS OF LAWS AND RULES**

**PENALTY ASSESSMENT: TC-190130
PENALTY AMOUNT: \$800**

Pacific Northwest Transportation Services, Inc.
d/b/a Capital Aeroporter
PO Box 2163
Olympia, WA 98507

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) believes that Pacific Northwest Transportation Services, Inc. d/b/a Capital Aeroporter (Capital Aeroporter or Company) violated Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-30-221, Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 391 – Qualifications of Drivers.

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 81.04.405 allows penalties of \$100 for each violation. In the case of an ongoing violation, every day's continuance is considered a separate and distinct violation.

On February 21, 2019, Commission Motor Carrier Investigator Robert Auderer completed a focused safety investigation of Capital Aeroporter and documented the following violations:

- **Eight violations of Title 49 CFR Part 391.45(b)(1) – Using a driver without a current medical examiner's certificate.** Capital Aeroporter allowed employee Kiet A. Nguyen to drive on eight separate occasions with an expired medical examiner's certificate. The violations occurred between October 7, 2018, and October 28, 2018.

The Commission considered the following factors in determining the appropriate penalties for these violations:

1. **How serious or harmful the violations are to the public.** The violations noted are serious and potentially harmful to the public. Companies using a driver with expired medical certification put the traveling public at risk. A driver with a potentially undetected medical condition presents serious safety concerns.
2. **Whether the violations were intentional.** Considerations include:
 - Whether the company ignored Commission staff's previous technical assistance; and
 - Whether there is clear evidence through documentation or other means that shows the company knew of and failed to correct the violation.

Capital Aeroporter has been in operation since 1993, and currently possesses both auto transportation and charter and excursion certificates with the Commission.

On April 14, 2016, Commission Motor Carrier Investigator Sandra Yeomans completed a routine safety investigation of Capital Aeroporter that included technical assistance. The Company knew or should have known about these requirements.

3. **Whether the Company self-reported the violations.** The Company did not self-report these violations.
4. **Whether the Company was cooperative and responsive.** Capital Aeroporter was responsive and cooperative throughout the investigation.
5. **Whether the Company promptly corrected the violations and remedied the impacts.** The Company corrected these violations prior to the January 2019 focused safety investigation. Kiet A. Nguyen received a valid medical examiner's certificate on October 29, 2019.
6. **The number of violations.** Commission staff identified one violation type with a total of eight occurrences.
7. **The number of customers affected.** The Company reported 1,849,007 intrastate miles traveled in 2017. A significant number of customers, as well as members of the traveling public, were potentially affected by these safety violations.
8. **The likelihood of recurrence.** The Commission does not know if Capital Aeroporter is likely to repeat these safety violations; however, the Company was cooperative, willingly accepted technical assistance, and corrected the violations prior to the focused safety investigation.
9. **The Company's past performance regarding compliance, violations, and penalties.** On May 2, 2016, Capital Aeroporter was penalized \$100 in Docket TE-160332 for failing to maintain driving record inquiries in drivers' qualification files.
10. **The Company's existing compliance program.** Fred Kellogg, Safety Director of Capital Aeroporter, is responsible for the Company's safety compliance program.
11. **The size of the Company.** Capital Aeroporter operates 17 commercial motor vehicles, and employs 35 commercial motor vehicle drivers. The Company reported \$2,413,293.06 in gross revenue in 2017.

The Commission's Enforcement Policy provides that some Commission requirements are so fundamental to safe operations that the Commission will issue mandatory penalties for each occurrence of a first-time violation.¹ The Commission generally will assess penalties per type of violation, rather than per occurrence, for first-time violations of those critical regulations that do

¹ Docket A-120061 – Enforcement Policy of the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission – Section V.

not meet the requirements for mandatory penalties. The Commission will assess penalties for any equipment violation meeting the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's "out-of-service" criteria and also for repeat violations of critical regulations, including each occurrence of a repeat violation.

The Commission has considered these factors and determined that it should penalize Capital Aeroporter \$800 for violations of WAC 480-30-221, Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 CFR Part 391, calculated as follows:

- Eight violations of Title 49 CFR Part 391.45(b)(1) – Using a driver without a current medical examiner's certificate. These are first-time violations of a fundamental safety requirement. The Commission assesses penalties in the amount of \$100 per occurrence, for a total of \$800.

This information, if proven at a hearing and not rebutted or explained, is sufficient to support the penalty assessment.

Your penalty is due and payable now. If you believe any or all of the violations did not occur, you may deny committing the violation(s) and contest the penalty through evidence presented at a hearing or in writing. Or, if there is a reason for any or all of the violations that you believe should excuse you from the penalty, you may ask for mitigation (reduction) of the penalty through evidence presented at a hearing or in writing. The Commission will grant a request for hearing only if material issues of law or fact require consideration of evidence and resolution in a hearing. Any request to contest the violation(s) or for mitigation of the penalty must include a written statement of the reasons supporting that request. Failure to provide such a statement will result in denial of the request. *See* RCW 81.04.405.

If you properly present your request for a hearing and the Commission grants that request, the Commission will review the evidence supporting your dispute of the violation(s) or application for mitigation in a Brief Adjudicative Proceeding before an administrative law judge. The administrative law judge will consider the evidence and will notify you of his or her decision.

You must act within 15 days after receiving this notice to do one of the following:

- Pay the amount due.
- Contest the occurrence of the violations.
- Request mitigation to contest the amount of the penalty.

Please indicate your selection on the enclosed form and submit it electronically through the Commission's web portal **within FIFTEEN (15) days** after you receive this notice. If you are unable to use the web portal, you may submit it via email to records@utc.wa.gov. If you are unable to submit the form electronically, you may send a paper copy to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, PO Box 47250, Olympia, Washington 98504-7250.

If you do not act within 15 days, the Commission may take additional enforcement action, including but not necessarily limited to suspending or revoking your certificate to provide regulated service, assessing additional penalties, or referring this matter to the Office of the Attorney General for collection.

DATED at Olympia, Washington, and effective March 19, 2019.

/s/ Rayne Pearson
RAYNE PEARSON
Director, Administrative Law Division

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
PENALTY ASSESSMENT TC-190130

PLEASE NOTE: You must complete and sign this document, and send it to the Commission within 15 days after you receive the penalty assessment. Use additional paper if needed. I have read and understand RCW 9A.72.020 (printed below), which states that making false statements under oath is a class B felony. I am over the age of 18, am competent to testify to the matters set forth below and I have personal knowledge of those matters. I hereby make, under oath, the following statements.

1. **Payment of penalty.** I admit that the violations occurred and enclose \$800 in payment of the penalty.

2. **Contest the violations.** I believe that some or all of the alleged violations did not occur for the reasons I describe below (**if you do not include reasons supporting your contest here, your request will be denied**):

a) I ask for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to an administrative law judge for a decision

OR b) I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above.

3. **Application for mitigation.** I admit the violations, but I believe that the penalty should be reduced for the reasons set out below (**if you do not include reasons supporting your application here, your request will be denied**):

a) I ask for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to an administrative law judge for a decision

OR b) I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing, including information I have presented on any attachments, is true and correct.

Dated: _____ [month/day/year], at _____ [city, state]

Name of Respondent (Company) – please print

Signature of Applicant

RCW 9A.72.020:

“Perjury in the first degree. (1) A person is guilty of perjury in the first degree if in any official proceeding he makes a materially false statement which he knows to be false under an oath required or authorized by law. (2) Knowledge of the materiality of the statement is not an element of this crime, and the actor’s mistaken belief that his statement was not material is not a defense to a prosecution under this section. (3) Perjury in the first degree is a class